



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In the midst of this the Emperor of the most "paternal" government in Europe—if we except Russia—is taking this huge, unformed subject into his own hands. He has ended the "blood-and-iron" rule; he has said again and again that he "will make the man great who will aid him in his endeavor to find the just course and keep to it, and will crush him who opposes him"; and his government has found it wise to take off what restriction has been in the past put upon the discussion of the subject. There can be no doubt of the young Emperor's earnestness; and yet one of the greatest principles of the Social Democracy in Germany to-day is *self-government*. That is, a monarchy of the old style goes hand in hand with a party working for government by the people!

It is a peculiar situation, that must have some sort of settlement before many years have gone—that has no exit behind. Is it an attempt on the part of the imperial government to get control of the whole organization in order to regulate the movement by-and-by by seeming to favor it now? or is it only to delay matters until a European crisis is tided over? Time must answer.

J. H. SEARS.

II.

POLICE OUTRAGES IN NEW YORK.

THE police force of the city of New York has gained an enviable reputation for bravery, and when its members are called upon to act in great emergencies, they have never failed to justify this reputation. At times there occur also individual proofs of devotion to duty in moments of great peril. Perhaps it is all the more on this account that the exhibitions of cowardice and brutality which are too frequently made by individual members of the force shock the community so severely. Within the past six months several cases of extreme brutality and despicable cowardice have been brought to public attention, and in each instance the policeman has suffered no greater punishment than a trial on charges before the Police Board.

Every one of these cases was a most heinous exhibition of cowardice, because the policeman in each instance relied upon his uniform, his shield, his club, and his personal influence with his superiors to protect him from the consequences of his brutality and cowardice. When an officer in uniform relies upon his badges of authority so that he feels safe in beating citizens or in wounding them with insulting language and brutal actions, such an officer is not only a coward, but is unworthy to serve with a body of men who are accounted brave. A few cases illustrative of this unworthy conduct may be cited.

A policeman in one of the uptown precincts was approached some weeks ago by a young woman who besought him to repair a great injury which he had done her. She came to him, not seeking a policeman to protect her, but a man to set right a wrong he had committed. He seized her violently and even used his club upon her arm, and then dragged her to a station-house and complained of her as one who had been guilty of disorderly conduct. The court discharged the woman, and charges were preferred against the policeman. A brief hearing was had, and that seems to have been the end of the case. Yet the honor of every citizen in this community was involved in these charges, and the Board of Police Commissioners should have left no stone unturned that they might discover whether it were possible that a woman pleading with a man to save her honor was liable to receive as a reply blows from a policeman's club and arrest and imprisonment on a charge of disorderly conduct.

A policeman, spying two men in the early evening who were walking one of the streets and carrying a bundle between them, stopped them and seized the bundle, and when one of the men protested against the insolence of the officer's manner, the policeman arrested both of them. They were committed to a cell for the night, dragged before a police court in the morning, and, after a brief examination and investigation, were shown beyond question to be honest men. They were discharged, and the officer was reprimanded by the court. These men were most cruelly outraged, and yet the officer who had done this has not even been called to account by the Police Board.

A passenger on one of the Staten Island ferry-boats was assaulted by a loafer. When the boat landed at the ferry slip the injured man called upon an officer to arrest his assailant. The man's face was proof sufficient of the severity of the assault. It was cut and bleeding from blows. Witnesses said that the officer to whom the injured man appealed first insulted the suffering man with brutal words, and then punched him in the back with his club. These witnesses, being indignant, expostulated with the officer, only to be insulted themselves. They went to a police station to complain of the officer, and a few moments later he himself appeared, dragging with him the poor fellow whose only crime was that he had appealed to the police for protection. The next day this unfortunate victim was discharged by the court, and the policeman was summoned before the commissioners, and that is all the punishment he has ever had.

Some time ago a gentleman was entertaining two or three friends at his house, when a policeman suddenly appeared, seeking, he said, for a thief. The head of the house demanded the officer's warrant, and as none was shown the policeman was instantly ordered out of the house. Instead of going, he went to the window, broke it open, and appealed to those who were passing to come and assist him. In this way he secured aid enough to arrest the gentleman and his friends. They were locked up and humiliated by being compelled to appear in a police court the next morning. The commissioners would not even entertain a complaint against the officer who made the arrest.

An old gentleman, feeling giddy from a sudden attack of vertigo, appealed to an officer to get him a cab and send him to his home. He was a most reputable business man, and his appearance should have suggested that he was suffering from sudden illness. The officer, however, insulted him by declaring that he was drunk, dragged him with great violence to a police station, and left him in a cell. The next morning the invalid was found unconscious, and he died within a few hours. This officer was not even reprimanded.

Two gentlemen walking on upper Broadway chanced to meet a friend whom they had not seen for a long time, and stopped to shake hands with him. A moment later an officer, with great insolence of manner, came up and pushed the gentlemen violently along, saying: "Here, get a move on you." The gentlemen protested against this violence, when the officer raised his club and was about to arrest them. They were spared that ignominy, however, by the captain of the precinct, who had seen the whole occurrence. He said to the officer: "Go on your beat, sir; I know these men, and it is impossible that they should have committed any disturbance." The captain said that the officer was a good policeman in times of danger, but that he had no judgment.

These examples are selected at random from a very long list of indignities. The records of the Police Commissioners show that within a few years hundreds of complaints have been made by reputable citizens, who have felt that their persons and self-respect have been most shamefully abused by policemen. So many of these cases appear that it is apparent that, in spite of some great excellences, the force must carry the odium of containing many men who are capable of cowardice, insolence, and brutality. What is the reason that such abuses are of frequent occurrence? Clearly because some fault exists in the system by which the policemen are governed. If there be such fault, it lies with the board which controls the force.

This board has been nominally non-partisan for many years. When Thomas C. Acton was its president, nearly thirty years ago, he forbade, through a resolution adopted by the board, all persons connected with the department, from the commissioners down, from being members of any political club. Nominally this resolution was in force for some years. But the commissioners themselves were the first to break it through the creation of personal organizations called by their names, which were said to be non-partisan, but which were not. The demoralization growing out of these organizations was very great. A man desiring to get upon the police force had only to become an active member of the organization and establish himself as a favorite with the commissioner who controlled it. Then, having secured appointment, it was easy to retain favor, although nominally no longer a member of

the organization. In some districts a policeman's influence with voters can be made very great, and that, of course, creates what in the colloquialism of the force is called a "pull" with the commissioners. It is the men who have "pulls" who are the most likely to be insolent, cowardly, and brutal.

The fault, then, lies in the partisanship which controls the policemen, and which is all the more dangerous because the board is thought to be non-partisan. The remedy lies with the Police Board itself. There should be first an end put to any possible relations between the board and the members of the force except those of superior and subordinate. The board should then make every member of the force feel that any deviation from the right use of his power and responsibility is sure to be followed by swift and sufficient punishment. Next, any officer who has done that which justifies the infliction of severe punishment, such as suspension or dismissal, should be sent for trial, also, to some criminal tribunal, that he may be punished by the courts, as any other citizen would be, for misdemeanor. If the commissioners, having found a man guilty of misdemeanor, had the power not only to dismiss him, but to instruct the superintendent to make charges against him before a court of justice, that he might be punished penal, then some sufficient sense of restraint would be found to operate against the unlawful display of passion and malice by policemen.

E. J. EDWARDS.

III.

ARE WOMEN MANNERLESS ?

THE rapid generalizer is apt to rush to unsound conclusions. I think that a writer in the last number of THE REVIEW deduces his designation of women as "The Mannerless Sex" from a number of examples quite too limited.

While recognizing the truth of much that he says as to the rudeness of women in public places, I attribute almost wholly to men the responsibility for such bad manners as he instances. If women are "pushing" in banks and post-offices and street-cars, it is the men whose silly encouragement has made them so; and to prove this it is only necessary to mention the fact that it is exclusively *American* women that are under discussion: against European women no such charges of rudeness are ever made.

The question here arises whether American men cannot learn some valuable lessons from their trans-Atlantic brethren. In no railroad car in Europe, and in no street-car or omnibus, do men ever get up to give their seats to women; and the result is that every railroad company puts on cars enough to accomodate travellers, and then laws are passed providing that after all the seats are occupied no more passengers shall be admitted. So there are no standing passengers anywhere, and everybody who pays for a ride obtains a seat.

It seems to me that this method is much better than ours. And our railroads can be compelled to put on rolling stock adequate to the demands of the travelling public only by a persistent and concurrent refusal of men to surrender their seats to women. Such a refusal would be plainly just. Why should a man who has paid \$2 for a seat in a railroad car relinquish it to a woman any more than a man in the orchestra of a theatre should resign his \$2 seat ? Indeed, why should a man who has paid five cents for a street-car seat relinquish it to a woman merely because the company has sold her a seat for five cents and cannot deliver the thing sold ? And why should women accept such privileges as if a matter of right ? No refined woman would accept a postage-stamp from a stranger without paying him for it : why should she accept what has cost him more than twice as much ? Plainly because men have set the fashion of surrendering their seats under the plea of gallantry.

I might pause here to show that the words "gallantry," "politeness," "courtesy," etc., are meant to apply only to acts of deference which involve no financial loss, and do not properly include the transfer of things which have been paid for; but space will not permit such a digression.

A surrender of purchased seats and rights to elderly women or to women obviously ill would be bad enough; but the American method has come to include an indefinite extension of this habit which is pernicious in the extreme. If under the mercenary limitation of street-cars men continue to give seats to women who are ap-